

REMARKS

Independent claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball and Starnes. Amended claim 8 recites provide a graphical user interface for a display of a processor-based system, the interface including a navigation bar with a selectable subtract button image and a window to display a web page, in response to an initial selection of said subtract button image, difference a cached version and a current version of a web page and display the difference between said versions, and in response to subsequent selection of said subtract button image, toggle between the display of the current version and the display of the difference between the versions.

In some embodiments of the present invention browser software may be provided with differencing functionality. In other embodiments, software for differencing may be provided as a plug-in to an existing browser. Neither Ball nor Starnes disclose a browser with differencing functionality. For example, in Figure 12 of Ball, DIFF is a link on a HTML document. *See, e.g.*, column 20, lines 26-65. Further, the web browser in Ball does not directly interact with aspects of Ball. Column 20, lines 54-66. Also, Starnes' command bar 702 is added to an HTML file. *See* column 18, lines 23-38. Thus, neither reference discloses a browser that performs differencing in response to the selection of a subtract button image on the browser's navigation bar. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

Under a similar analysis, reconsideration of claim 15 is also requested.

Independent claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball in view of Starnes and in further view of Tsimelzon. In the Office action, the examiner concedes that Ball and Starnes fail to disclose automatically displaying an indication of the difference between two versions of a web page upon initial receipt of a current version. Office action, page 5. Claim 29 has been amended to recite upon initial receipt of a current version of an Internet web page by a browser application, automatically comparing the current version and a cached version of the page and displaying an indication of the difference between said versions, and toggling between displaying the indication of the difference and displaying the current page, the toggling in

response to user selection of a single button on a graphical user interface of a navigation bar for the browser.

Tsimelzon fails to cure the deficiency of Ball and Starnes. In the Office action, the examiner states "Tsimelzon suggests that users may desire to be informed of changes immediately upon viewing a current web page." Office action, page 5. While the cited passage of Tsimelzon does suggest that a user may choose to have changes in a shortpage (i.e., sub-elements of an original web page) highlighted, Tsimelzon does not elaborate on where the highlighting takes place. In general, the server 120 of Tsimelzon shortens a retrieved web page in accordance with selection information to form a shortpage and sends the shortpage to a client. *See* column 4, lines 32-50. Thus, Tsimelzon suggests that the highlighting option is preformed by the server 120. As such, Tsimelzon fails to cure the deficiencies of Ball and Starnes. For at least these reasons, reconsideration of the rejection of independent claim 29 and claims dependents thereon is requested.


CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

The commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0314US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 29, 2005



Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation